

refuse 'bad' papers, ones damaging progress, and only publish 'good' ones, which further it. Then Mr Zorab adds a new joke: claiming that in my proposed 'International Parapsychological Union' all Societies would be bound to authoritative verdicts of dictatorial character as to which facts have to be accepted as true, and which as false. A most horrible prospect! General hearty laughter should be added here! The need for free inter-changing of thoughts on all facts and problems is so self-evident that one should not waste a word about it. Yet: If there is inter-changing for 100 years without any result, and eternal 'keen scepticism' and doubt by the inexperienced against all experts, then we have the *stagnation* of today—with despair about the future!

8. Now at the end, one deciding point: What is the rule and purpose of a review at all? Obviously the reader should be informed about the contents of a book; best chapter by chapter, and the reviewer has the right to criticize as far as he is competent to do so. Yet how would he be able to criticize the expert if he himself is inexperienced? Bias and tendentiousness cannot help him! Mr Zorab curiously avoids on principle or completely forgets about referring to *all* the other contents of the book. Nothing is said about the detailed refutation of all arguments in Mr Hall's book against Crookes, nothing about the insertions regarding transfiguration, ideoplasty and double, telepathy and materialization. No mention about the excellent sittings of famous, especially German researchers with Florence in the absence of Crookes, or about the 52 pictures, 14 of which are of Katie King; nothing about system and ideology of Parapsychology, the critiques of five Journals, the reform of Parapsychology, the literary criticism, the 'legitimation' of the author to be competent to speak and write about physical-biological phenomena as an expert. The reader is not to know the real contents of the book, but to be deterred from reading it. Therefore I must ask that either all my criticisms be refuted as errors in a convincing manner, or else acknowledged, at least most of them.

HANS GERLOFF

Croiset the Clairvoyant

SIR,—In G. Zorab's review of J. H. Pollack's *Croiset the Clairvoyant* (*Journal*, December 1965) we feel some misjudgment might be present. Of course, Mr Zorab has the right to criticize this book as best he might, but his mentioning of Dr F. Brink's and Commissioner Mr Th. Roosmalen's activities in their attempts to discard some results of Gerard Croiset and Professor W. H. C.

Tenhaeff has little to do with the qualities of the book as such. Furthermore the combined efforts made by Tenhaeff and Croiset to document hundreds of paragnostical cases, are far beyond detailed criticism. There is little doubt that in every Croiset case mis-judgments are present, but all really honest scientific insiders know that *this is not* the astonishing fact. Astonishing indeed are Croiset's correct hits, his spontaneously giving exact answers to telephone calls (all being automatically registered on magnetic tape), as well as during psychometric sittings. The enormously extensive material now present in the Institute for Parapsychology of Utrecht University represents the documentation of more than ten years of research in Parapsychology. The collection concerning Croiset is the richest one, and Tenhaeff has gathered it as carefully as any pioneer in this field could have done. This 'gold mine' was used by Pollack for writing a very readable and systematically arranged book in which more than fifty cases by Croiset have been described: directly from Professor Tenhaeff's records.

We think this book a positive contribution to the descriptive side of parapsychology. The fact remains that 'chair tests' in only one out of 12 chapters of this book could be criticized and attacked on some points. But, so what? Who in the world is able to do 100 per cent correct work in Parapsychology? Everybody concerned is doing his best, and that is also what Pollack, Croiset and Tenhaeff have been doing.

J. KISTEMAKER (Chairman, Netherlands S.P.R.)

W. GORTER (Hon. Sec., Netherlands S.P.R.)

The point I wanted to stress in my review of Pollack's book was not to express doubts as to Croiset's ESP gifts, but to caution against their documentation. Pollack bases himself, as he himself affirms, practically entirely on Dr Tenhaeff's books, articles etc., and what Dr Tenhaeff told him about Croiset. As a journalist without much training in parapsychological research, Pollack did not study the Croiset case really critically: he simply echoed Dr Tenhaeff's sayings and writings. This approach makes the book decidedly lop-sided and induced me to quote some opinions running counter (those of the police-officers Dr Brink and Mr Roosmalen in the police cases) to those expressed in the book (i.e. Dr Tenhaeff's point of view).

That Dr Tenhaeff's recording is sometimes defective is proved by the case: 'An Educator's Dilemma' which Pollack copied literally from one of Dr Tenhaeff's books. And if such inaccuracies are possible and do occur we are, I feel, justified in concluding that 'the "gold-mine" used by Pollack for his writing, etc.' contains at

least some amount of alloy. And it was exactly this contamination of the 'gold' that I wanted to spotlight in my review.

G. ZORAB

A correction

SIR,—I much regret that in the last line of my reply to Mr Garnett on p. 251 of the March *Journal* the two times 17.2 seconds and 3.23 seconds were copied down wrongly. Actually these figures were the average time for 24 movements of the experimenter's hand from the screen aperture to the bowl, and the standard deviation of this average. For a *single* movement, the first time has to be divided by 24 giving an average time of 0.71 seconds. The standard error of this mean now works out to 0.09 seconds; 24 is, of course, the number of time-intervals which elapse during the presentation of the 25 counters.

S. G. SOAL

*Cae Garw,
Betws-y-Coed,
Caerns*

The Fawcett Scripts

SIR,—In the *Journal* for March, 1966, Mr Simeon Edmunds pinpoints some striking parallels between passages in Miss Geraldine Cummins' automatic scripts, which purport to come from the surviving Colonel Fawcett, and others written by Colonel Fawcett himself before his death. He also lists various possible sources, including subconscious memory, for automatic scripts in general, commenting wisely that 'few who argue about them appear completely objective in their attitudes.' Some of his further comments, however, emphasize a difficulty which often crops up in psychical research. Like Mr Edmunds we all seek to be objective, to take in the whole picture. But how are we to tell when we have failed?

Some degree of failure may be almost inevitable, seeing how profoundly the mentality of most investigators differs from that of most sensitives. The first is usually rational, 'sunlit', given and trained to analysis and verbal thinking, often with an admirable conscious memory but lacking in personal ESP-type experience. The second is initiative, synthetic, 'moonlit', given to image thinking, with sometimes a weak conscious memory, but a broad highway between conscious and subconscious. How can such an investigator divorce himself from his natural viewpoint enough to see such a sensitive as anything but unreliable and 'moonstruck'? Or the sensitive look on him as anything but destructive and bone-